



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/787,410

02/27/2004

Jong-jin Yi

Q78932

4531

23373 7590 05/03/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/787,410	YI, JONG-JIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abbas I. Abdulsalam	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,8-10,12-15,18 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,6,7,11,16,17,19-21,23 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to a communication filed on 02/08/07. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/08/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references, Kavanagh (USPN 6809726) and (USPN 7106307) alone or in combination do not teach "a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit". However, as shown in the art rejection below, Kavanagh teaches if the coordinates for an actual touch points (20) are not valid, control logic processor (32) executes recomputation step (42), or rejects compute coordinates (42) as indicated Fig. 5 (42), col. 5, lines 9-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize Kavanagh's control logic processor (32) as configured in Fig. 4 for the purpose of selectively maintaining or disregarding the result of an execution as taught by Kavanagh.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2629

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5, 8-10, 12-15, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavanagh (USPN 6809726) in view of Cok (USPN 7106307).

Kavanagh teaches a touch screen system, comprising, (touchscreen display, col. 3, lines 13-18 and Fig. 3 (10)) a display unit for displaying at least one of a plurality of interfaces; (coordinate boundary (18) such as circle and other shapes, col. 4, lines 12-14 and Fig. 3(18)) a touch panel for outputting a signal in correspondence with a touch input on the display unit; (display (10) with a calibration point (24) col. 4, lines 20-24 and Fig. 3 (10, 24), displaying at least one calibration target and sensing a calibration touch for at least one calibration target, col. 2, lines 49-50 and col. 2, line 52. Note the term "calibration" refers to mapping that provides correct alignment of touch panel coordinates to display coordinates, col. 1, lines 51-52) a coordinate value storage unit for storing coordinate value information indicating an active region of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces; (control logic processor (32) includes storage device, memory (48) which functions as a data base in which coordinates entered for each valid calibration operation are stored, col. 4, lines 39-43 and fig. 4 (32, 48); note that valid operation is meant within an acceptable boundary (18), col. 4, lines 61-64) a decision unit for deciding whether the first coordinate values exist in the active region indicated by the coordinate value information stored in the coordinate value storage unit, in a decision; (a control logic processor (32) determines whether the coordinates for each touch point (20) are within an acceptable coordinate boundary (18), col. 4, lines 61-64. As discussed above, the control logic processor (32) also has a memory (48) in which coordinates entered for each valid calibration

Art Unit: 2629

operation are stored) and a control unit for interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active region according to the decision of the decision unit (if the coordinates for an actual touch points (20) are not valid, control logic processor (32) executes recomputation step (42), or rejects compute coordinates (42) as indicated Fig. 5 (42), col. 5, lines 9-11).

While kavanagh teaches a control logic processor (32) obtaining the coordinates of the actual touch point (20) for each calibration target displayed (col. 4, lines 56-58, Fig. 3 (20) and Fig. 4 (32)), kavanagh does not teach calculating first coordinate values of the touch input based on the signal outputted from the touch panel.

Cok on the other hand teaches an external controller 18 coordinating the application of various signals to the touch screen 10, and performing calculations based on responses of the touch sensitive elements to touches, in order to extract the (X, Y) coordinates of the touch (col. 1, lines 39-44 and Fig. 1 (18)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kavanagh's touch screen control system shown in Fig. 4 to adapt Cok's external controller 18 as configured in Fig. 1 because the use of an external controller (18) helps compute a location of the touch in a touch screen (10) as taught by Cok (col. 1, lines 35-37).

Regarding claim 2, Kavanagh teaches the coordinate value information stored in the coordinate value storage unit is updated according to a first interface to be activated (if the touch point 20 coordinates are verified to be within an acceptable coordinate boundary (18), control

Art Unit: 2629

logic processor 32 stores the verified coordinates in a data base 48 (co. 5, lines 3-5); note there is only one acceptable coordinate boundary (18) as shown in Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 5, Kavanagh teaches a control method for a touch screen system having a display unit for displaying at least one of a plurality of interfaces and a touch panel for outputting a signal corresponding to a touch input on the display unit, (touchscreen display, Fig. 3 (10), coordinate boundary (18) such as circle and other shapes, col. 4, lines 12-14 and Fig. 3(18), display (10) with a calibration point (24) col. 4, lines 20-24 and Fig. 3 (10, 24), displaying at least one calibration target and sensing a calibration touch for at least one calibration target, col. 2, lines 49-50 and col. 2, line 52.) comprising steps of: deciding whether the first coordinate values exist in an active region of an active interface of the plurality of the interfaces; (a control logic processor (32) determines whether the coordinates for each touch point (20) are within an acceptable coordinate boundary (18), col. 4, lines 61-64) and interrupting a response to the touch input if the first coordinate values exist outside the active regions as a result of the decision (if the coordinates for an actual touch points (20) are not valid, control logic processor (32) executes recomputation step (42), or rejects computed coordinates (42) as indicated Fig. 5 (42), col. 5, lines 9-11).

While kavanagh teaches a control logic processor (32) obtaining the coordinates of the actual touch point (20) for each calibration target displayed (col. 4, lines 56-58, Fig. 3 (20) and Fig. 4 (32)), kavanagh does not teach calculating first coordinate values of the touch input based on the signal outputted from the touch panel.

Cok on the other hand teaches an external controller 18 coordinating the application of various signals to the touch screen 10, and performing calculations based on responses of the touch sensitive elements to touches, in order to extract the (X, Y) coordinates of the touch (col. 1, lines 39-44 and Fig. 1 (18)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kavanagh's touch screen control system shown in Fig. 4 to adapt Cok's external controller 18 as configured in Fig. 1 because the use of an external controller (18) helps compute a location of the touch in a touch screen (10) as taught by Cok (col. 1, lines 35-37).

Regarding claims 8, 18 and 22, kavanagh teaches one interface of the plurality of interfaces is one of a box, a window, an icon, and a bar (coordinate boundary 18 shown as a circle in Fig. 3 may take shapes such as a square, rectangle ellipse etc., col. 4, lines 12-14).

Regarding claim 9, Kavanagh teaches the signal is a predetermined sensing signal (the calibration target corresponding to a previously determined calibration reference point; and sensing a calibration touch for at least one calibration target, col. 2, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 10, kavanagh's teaches the first coordinate values indicate a position of the touch input (control logic processor 32 obtains the coordinates of the actual touch point 20 for each calibration target displayed, col. 4, lines 56-58).

Regarding claim 12, Kavanagh teaches the one interface of the plurality of interfaces is one of a box, a window, an icon, and a bar (coordinate boundary 18 shown as a circle in Fig. 3 may take shapes such as a square, rectangle ellipse etc., col. 4, lines 12-14).

Regarding claim 13, Kavanagh teaches the signal is a predetermined sensing signal (the calibration target corresponding to a previously determined calibration reference point; and sensing a calibration touch for at least one calibration target, col. 2, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 14, Kavanagh teaches the first coordinate values indicate a position of the touch input (control logic processor 32 obtains the coordinates of the actual touch point 20 for each calibration target displayed, col. 4, lines 56-58).

Regarding claim 15, Kavanagh teaches interrupting the response comprises ignoring the touch input (Fig. 5 (42), rejecting compute coordinates, col. 5, lines 32-36).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-4, 6-7, 11, 16-17, 19-21 and 23-24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abbas I. Abdulsalam whose telephone number is 571-272-7685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2629

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abbas abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2629

April 27, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hjerpe', is positioned above the printed name and title.

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600